

A Plain and Concise
Explanation of

**KNOWLEDGE
IS
POWER**

SCIENTIFIC . . SOCIALISM

By THOMAS BERSFORD,

He who shortens
the road to
Knowledge
lengthens life.

Entered According to Act of Congress,
in the year, 1899,
In the office of the Librarian of Con-
gress at Washington, D. C.

Price 10 Cents

INDEX

| | Page |
|--|-------|
| Definitions of Socialism.. | 3 |
| What is Science.. | 5 |
| Inductive and Deductive Method of Reasoning.. | 6 |
| Dialectic and Metaphysical Reasoning.. | 8 |
| Materialistic Conception of History.. | 10 |
| Class Consciousness and the Class Struggle.. | 19 |
| Industrial Evolution.. | 23 |
| Utopian and Christian Socialists, etc.. | 26 |
| Human Nature.. | 30 |
| Morals, Ethics, Rights, etc.. | 13 |
| Society an Organism.. | 33 |
| Value, Capital, Wealth, Surplus, Value, etc.. | 34-37 |
| Summary of the facts of Scientific Socialism.. | 39 |

A Plain and Concise Explanation of

SCIENTIFIC . . SOCIALISM

By THOMAS BERSFORD,

Author of "A Philosophy of Happiness."



Address orders for this book, and "A Philosophy of Happiness" and the Derringer Pocket Book of Statistics to T. Bersford, Labor Bureau Association, 915½ Market Street, San Francisco, California.

PREFACE.

It has been stated that though millions of people play at chess, there are but few real chess players. A like statement might be made of Socialists, for though millions of votes (the total Socialist vote of all countries is about six millions) are cast for Socialism, there are but few scientific Socialists and there are comparatively few really practical scientific works upon the subject and fewer still are the scientific books which the average working-man can understand. The Socialist movement is essentially a working class movement, yet those three masterpieces of Socialist philosophy—The Communist Manifesto, Socialism from Utopia to Science, and Capital, abound with abstruse and technical terms. which are not merely confusing, but are positively unintelligible to most workingmen.

In preparing the following pages, my object was not so much to give an outline of Socialism, as to help students to grasp the essence of larger and completer works upon the subject.

If I have failed in this, I will try again, for I am convinced that when a propertiless wage-worker refuses to believe in Socialism, it is because he does not understand it; the fault lies not with the principles, but with the manner of explaining them. I have endeavored to combine brevity with the simplest language so as to be easily understood by workingmen. I am aware that in this endeavor, elegance is often sacrificed, but believe that in a pamphlet of this kind absolute clearness is of greater importance than elegance of language.

Some of the definitions given are my own, but I think they will be acceptable to scientific Socialists.

WHAT IS MEANT BY SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM.

The word Socialism is ambiguous. Used in one sense it means the philosophy or doctrines of those people who advocate or predict a Socialist system; used in another sense Socialism means a distinct kind of social system or state of society. Thus we speak of the Patriarchal system, the Feudal system, the Capitalist system, the Socialist system or Socialism.

As the name of a system, Socialism means a form or state of society, in which all the means of production and distribution (i. e., the land, tools, railways, factories, stores, etc., the means by which society lives) are operated on a system of organized national labor on the basis of collective or common ownership of the means of production by all members of society with democratic management or control by the workers themselves, of the processes of production and distribution and an equitable system of distribution of the products of social labor.

This is the ideal, the aim, the prediction of Socialists.

For ages men have thought more or less vaguely of an ideal social system. In all generations, from the days of Plato (who wrote of an Ideal Republic) to the present day, there have been men who believed in and advocated some sort of a co-operative social system; men intuitively recognize that somewhere in the direc-

tion of co-operation and democracy the greatest happiness is to be found. But notwithstanding the brilliancy of its philosophers, the eloquence of its agitators, the bravery of its martyrs and heroes, Socialism is still unrealized, has not yet triumphed, and this fact is considered, by persons who have not studied the subject very deeply, a proof that Socialism never can prevail.

But the statement that Socialism is one of those theories which sound well, but prove impracticable, was not accepted as positive proof by earnest thinkers, they continued to philosophize, continued to advocate. "Look, they said, the advantages of co-operative industry are so obvious—freedom from grasping landlords and employers, no fear of want and worry and cutting competition, but, short hours of labor, leisure time for pleasure and study. Economy, fraternity, justice—all these are to be found in a co-operative industrial democracy!" "Why could not the people see? Why could not Socialism be brought about?"

The scientific Socialist will reply that it was because the economic basis of such a system did not exist, but the superficial opponent will usually answer such questions by saying: It's against human nature! Man is too selfish, etc.! This is about the main argument of most anti-Socialists, and certainly if man be regarded as the descendent of a God-made creature, perfect in form and mind, he cannot be considered encouraging; but if man be looked upon as a development, a product of evolution, not merely from the savage state, but from the lowest form of life, then he not only arouses admiration and encouragement, but taxes our imagination to conceive what his ultimate development will be.

During the past century science has made the most miraculous strides and the enormous amount of literature issued has spread knowledge broadcast over the world.

With greater knowledge has come a decided spirit of investigation, and the tendency of the present age is to be scientific, to search for the causes, the reasons why and wherefore. Beautiful ideals, eloquence, philanthropic motives, these meet with but cold reception from science.

How often scientific men are heard to say: "These are your theories; what are your FACTS?"

This, then, is the question before us. **WHAT ARE THE FACTS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM?**

In addition to facts, scientific men insist upon explicit definition of terms and a correct method of reasoning and before we proceed further, perhaps it is well to give a few definitions:

FACT a reality, an act or thing accomplished.

TRUTH is correct statement of that which is or has been.

SCIENCE is a collection of established facts formed into general laws for the purpose of establishing relation between cause and effect.

SCIENTIFIC means according to science, based on actual knowledge or facts.

REASONING is estimating the evidence, comparing the facts.

ECONOMIC, pertaining to the production and distribution of wealth.

SYNTHESIS, that process of reasoning in which we advance by a regular chain from principles established or assumed and propositions already proved until we arrive at a conclusion.

It is very difficult (as every logician is aware) to state even what we know to be facts, in such language, that their truth will be generally acknowledged, for people view things from different stand-points and they do not all use the same mode of reasoning, nor do they all know an equal number of facts (the principal difference between the scientist and the unscientific man is the greater number of facts known by the scientist). Moreover, many things which appear to be self-evident facts (such as that the earth is flat or that the sun moves round the earth), have been proved by science to be illusions. Yet, all the brilliant and learned men of olden times believed (so far as we know) that the earth was flat. This shows how untrustworthy is our judgment, when unaccompanied by actual knowledge of the facts.

In the absence of actual knowledge we advance theories as to the probable causes of phenomena and men have a tendency to draw upon their imaginations for facts to suit their arguments, and, to quote an old saying "the wish is often father to the thought." Very often an argument seems quite plausible until investigation proves that it has no facts to support it.

Reasoning to be effective must be predicated upon facts, and in order to leave as little as possible to mere speculation, when constructing hypotheses or theories, scientific men use

THE INDUCTIVE METHOD OF REASONING.

In inductive reasoning we start with known facts and make inferences from them and by adding other facts as arguments we eliminate as much as possible

the element of uncertainty; we go on establishing facts and connecting them with one another by close relations. It is the chain of these relations which constitute science.

The difference between inductive and deductive reasoning is that in induction we proceed from individual and special facts to a hypothesis, while in deduction we start with a hypothesis or theory and proceed to apply it to the individual and special facts.

Of course, we cannot reason entirely by induction. When investigating a given theory we use the deductive method; we analyze and compare the theory with the facts.

The method used in philosophy (by modern philosophers) is "the reduction by analysis of a given synthesis to its elementary constituents, in order to reconstruct it in the forms of abstract thought from its primary datum."

An induction has been defined as a legitimate inference from the known to the unknown. When we say that it will snow in say Canada during the winter, we are not really certain that it will, but we know that it always has in the past and we therefore infer that it will again. An authority on logic says that, when we have reason to think that any instance to the contrary would be known to us, the argument possesses value and when there are no cases to the contrary, no stronger argument can be adduced.

The fact is that in all reasoning, we must make assumptions which may theoretically be questioned but of the truth of which no man in practice entertains the slightest doubt.

DIALECTICAL VS. METAPHYSICAL REASON- ING.

The inductive method will not insure us against error if we regard facts as eternally facts; that is, if we gratuitously assume that a statement which is true of a thing to-day will always be true; for instance, in 1812 a naval authority declared that a 50-gun frigate was the best ship for all round naval work, and possibly it was, in those days, but we know that a ship of that sort would be very far indeed from the best in a modern navy.

Thus we see that what was once true of this ship, is no longer true; conditions have changed and the ideas of naval men have had to change with the conditions, for the crushing defeat of slow wooden ships by fast ironclads soon compelled a change of opinion in regard to ships; yet these same naval men, although they fully realize that ship construction is constantly changing, probably fail to see that everything else is also in process of evolution.

Probably nothing has caused more confusion in philosophy than the metaphysical way of viewing things.

METAPHYSICS views things as fixed and apart from processes and changes.

DIALECTICS views everything as evolving, as being in process of change; that is, as having a history and being in connection with other things which are also evolving.

MATERIALIST, one who denies the existence of spiritual substances and accounts for the universe by matter alone or matter and motion.

IDEALIST, one who idealizes or seeks an ideal or ideal conditions; also one who believes in idealism.

IDEALISM, the doctrine that the real is of the nature of thought; that all reality is in its nature psychical.

IDEOLOGIST, one who fabricates ideal schemes, a theorist.

IDEOLOGY, the science that treats of the history of ideas.

Science has demonstrated that all organic life (i. e., animals, (including men) Plants, etc., every form of animal and vegetable life), is the product of evolution and that this evolution is still going on. The evidence in support of the theory of evolution is so conclusive that no person of any attainment in the world of science, now questions the correctness of the theory, but, though most people understand what is meant by the word Evolution, very few, even of professional men, realize the full significance of the teachings of evolution.

To many, evolution implies nothing more than the idea that man evolved from a monkey; that since becoming a man he has made no further change.

It is hard for some men to realize that they are mortal; it seems harder still for them to realize that a social system changes; that, like a human being, it has birth, growth, decay, and dissolution.

It is strange that men who live in the great modern cities should take a metaphysical view of things, but some men are so unobservant and such creatures of habit, in thought, as well as deed, that though they see the most miraculous inventions and the most mar-

velous machines introduced almost daily, though they see the incandescent light, the hydraulic elevator, the electric car and the swift ocean steamer; though they see the gigantic trust develop and crush the smaller businesses out of existence; though they see thousands of men displaced by machinery, yet they fail to realize that men and things are evolving, that conditions are changing.

MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.

There is nothing which history brings out more clearly than the fact that man constantly changes his customs, his laws and his methods; almost any school boy can describe the successive changes in dress and weapons; first, there was the club, the stone axe, then the sling and the javelin, then the bow and arrow, then steel armor with sword and lance, the flint lock musket, the percussion lock, the repeating rifle, the automatic Maxim gun.

The history of man's development from barbarism to his present state may be divided into four stages: THE HUNTING STAGE, in which he lived by hunting and fishing and on berries, fruits, etc.

THE PASTORAL STAGE, herding goats, swine, sheep, etc.

THE AGRICULTURAL STAGE, when man settled down and tilled the soil.

THE MANUFACTURING STAGE, man uses machinery and produces goods for sale.

All development, mental and material, has been the direct result of economic progress; so long as man hunted and fished for food, his living was precarious; he had no time to think or study, but when he settled

down and tilled the soil and herded goats, sheep, etc., his food was more certain; he then had time to think, and from that point begins the history of art, science, and mental development generally.

To fully realize that material and economic progress must precede intellectual progress, we have only to reflect upon the intellectual development of savage and semi-savage races and we find that their mental development is in precise ratio to their material and economic progress.

The idealist imagines that personal conceptions of what ought to be, etc., also ideas of virtue, justice and right, were the causes of man becoming civilized, but history shows that all these ideas were secondary to economic progress; that the order of progress was from the material to the social and moral. It was not until man found it paid better to make his captives, slaves, to raise food and things for him, that he ceased to be a cannibal.

He used to kill his prisoners and eat them, but when he found the great advantages of keeping slaves, he discovered that cannibalism was immoral; and the same is true of chattel slavery; when men found that they could get all the slaves they needed by simply owning the means of living (land, tools, etc.), then, and not till then, did chattel slavery become really immoral.

It can be demonstrated mathematically that wage workers are cheaper to the capitalists than chattel slaves could be; in fact, the capitalist system could not exist with chattel slavery.

It is evident that men would not work for masters, except by compulsion.

Before the advent of machinery any man could make or procure the few and primitive tools then used and employ himself, therefore **THE ONLY WAY FOR MEN TO LIVE OFF THE WORKER'S LABOR WAS TO OWN THE WORKER** himself; the worker was then kept a slave by physical force. But when machinery was invented, the worker without capital was unable to employ himself because his hand-made products were undersold by machine-made products; he could neither compete with the machinery nor could he own it; it was too costly with its steam power, big factories, etc. The worker then had to go to the capitalist and beg to be hired; a slave, held not by chains and whips, but by his physical needs, food, clothing and shelter; the large body of unemployed keeps the slaves meek and willing.

Our capitalists are virtuous; they say chattel slavery is immoral, and (they might add), besides, it no longer pays.

The history of mankind since the days of primitive society has been one long succession of struggles between the exploiting classes and the slave or working classes.

Karl Marx, its brilliant discoverer, explains the materialistic conception of history in the following words: The conception that

"The economic structure of society at any time prevalent constitutes the real basis and explains in the last instance the whole superstructure of juridic and political institutions, as also the religious, philosophic and all other ideas of each historic period, accordingly the prime causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be traced, not to the ideas of men,

not to their increasing perception of eternal truth and justice, but to the changes in the manner of production and exchange; they are to be traced not to the philosophy, but to the economics of the respective epochs."

ETHICS, RIGHTS, JUSTICE, ETC.

By the materialistic conception of history we are enabled to see that man's conduct toward his fellow-man has not changed or improved as a result of ethical teaching, but that ideas of right conduct, etc., have changed with the changes in economic conditions; in other words, that there is an evolution in ideas as well as in material things, etc., and "that the ideas prevalent in any age are the reflex of the then prevailing economic conditions."

The person who denies this statement must prove that the same ideas of justice, morals, rights, etc., prevail among all peoples and at all stages of history; this, we know, cannot be done; moreover, we know that in spite of the ethical teachings of Christianity and other religions, immorality, injustice and cruel wrong still prevail; the golden rule is not yet in operation. The fact is, however loth some may be to admit it, that we have no just reason to doubt that all human action is the result of self-interest.

Whether it be directly, in self-gratification, desire for fame and wealth, or indirectly, through benevolence, love, or in pleasing others; whatever form it takes, it will be found to be the result of self-interest, and men will pursue this self-interest whether it pleases or injures others. As Hartley said: "With self-interest man must begin, he may end in self-anni-

hilation." Of course, gross selfishness brings its own punishment and men dare not be too brutal for fear of their neighbors, for only persons of position and power can practise tyranny.

We find that sentiment is a secondary and not a primary cause of action. Many actions which appear to be the result of mere sentiment prove on investigation to be caused primarily by the economic interest of some person or class of persons; for instance, the sentiment in favor of free coinage of silver was largely moulded by the agitators and newspapers paid by the silver mine owners, who, if free coinage of silver were established, would have an enormous demand and a good price for their commodity (silver).

The sentiment against negro chattel slavery was largely influenced by the economic interests of the merchants and manufacturers of the northern States; and, in addition to other things, the workers of the northern States were told that they had to compete with the slave labor of the South, that this was the cause of low wages, and if slavery were abolished wages would go up.

Patriotic sentiment has also an economic foundation; it pays the capitalists to mold this sentiment; the workers of each country are always taught that they enjoy greater liberty and better conditions than the workers of any other country.

It is to the interest of the capitalist class, not only to have servants and slaves, but to have these slaves contented and patriotic, for so long as they are contented and patriotic, there is no danger of the slaves turning upon their oppressors, which they most cer-

tainly would do if their attention was not kept continually distracted.

Allusions are frequently made by speakers, etc., to Rights; a man's natural rights, etc. On investigation, we find that ideas of rights vary and that a right means nothing more than that, which, in the opinion of the person speaking, would be just and in accordance with the laws which he personally thinks ought to prevail.

If we base our arguments upon historic conceptions of rights, they can lead to nothing but endless confusion, for men of the most opposite views can each quote so-called authorities for their ideas of rights; for instance, the divine right to property, the divine right of kings, and yet again, the divine right of the people, *Vox populi, vox Dei*.

Prof. Holland defines a right as "a man's capacity of influencing the acts of another, by means not of his own strength, but of the opinion or the force of society; a legal right in the strictest sense is a capacity residing in one man of controlling with the assent or assistance of the state, the actions of others."

The fact is that rights, justice, morals, etc., are metaphysical (i. e., exist in the mind only); they are simply what persons or classes of persons choose to interpret them. Now, it is evident that the ruling class in society (controlling, as it does, the sources of education, as well as the law-making and law-enforcing power) will always interpret rights, etc., to suit its class interest, and this is precisely what history shows has always been the case, for as Marx expressed it: "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class."

Mr. Wm. Lecky, in his "History of Morals," points out that when the Roman slaves were few, it was not considered moral to ill treat and murder them, as was done when they were more numerous; also that, the Roman Emperors (who continually apprehended plots against their lives or power), encouraged numerous spies around the more important of their subjects and the facility with which slaves could discover the proceedings of their masters, inclined the Government in their favor and it was these influences which altered the legal position of the slaves and laws against wanton slaughter of slaves by their masters. Strange to say, the Emperor Nero, the reputed greatest of tyrants, is credited with passing more favorable laws for the slaves than any other Roman Emperor.

History shows us that no matter how often the ideas of right conduct, etc., changed, the morals, customs and laws in force were always those of the then ruling class, whether that class was the Patrician of ancient Rome, the Feudal Barons of the middle ages or the Capitalists of modern times.

Thus, we may say, that morality, etc., (i. e., the morality that is general) is simply that code or line of conduct which the ruling class in society finds it most convenient to establish, and which it possesses the power to enforce; in short, anything is right, anything is moral, which the ruling class in a society makes a law or a custom.

Of course, when we imply that might makes right, we are speaking of classes and not of individual persons. If a great strong bully should knock a weaker man down and rob him, the bully would be arrested and punished; he would soon find that it is the might

or brute force of society, and not that of the individual, that makes right.

Now, as laws and ethical opinions are the reflex of the prevailing economic system, and as the now prevailing economic system is the capitalist system, it follows that the present laws are capitalist laws; that is, laws which secure the capitalists in possession of property and power; and capitalist ethics; that is, ideas of right conduct based on the right of the capitalist to own the means of living and to use these to enslave and exploit the workers.

The capitalist idea of ethical behavior on the part of the workers, is to be meek and fawning to your superiors. To be industrious; that is, to work early and late, and be a toady. To be ambitious, that is, to lie and slander in order to get ahead of your fellow workers in the opinion of your boss. To be enterprising; that is, to take advantage of the necessities of others to force them to pay more than the market price; to get a monopoly, and, if you get a chance, charge a green customer a dollar extra; in short, capitalist ethics tend to make a workman become a liar, a slanderer, a servile slave, a sneaking toady, a hypocrite and a thief.

The ruling classes of the various epochs have always ignored the rights of the lower classes and have never made any concessions to them unless compelled to do so either by physical force or by economic changes; the lower classes may have different ideas of rights, etc., but so long as they do not control the military force of society, their ideas are not respected.

Necessity causes changes in the ideas of rights, etc., and when economic necessity forces a revolution, com-

pels a lower class to rebel and establish itself as ruling class, then a new set of laws and morals are instituted.

The idealist imagines that economic conditions are subordinate to ideas; that it is through the influences of great thinkers, brilliant and noble leaders or divine inspiration, that the conditions of the lower classes have been improved. The evidence before us does not support this theory, but points distinctly to the development of machinery and improved methods of production, as the cause of better conditions.

When slaves can be secured without force, chains and whips are unnecessary, and when machinery can do the work, even the slaves become superfluous.

The truth is that, until we obtain a mastery over some of the forces of nature (i. e., steam, electricity, etc.), we are compelled to suit our ideas to our conditions; we can not suit our conditions to our ideas. The sun does not shine because we want to work by daylight, but we work in the daytime because then there is light.

So long as the tools of production were primitive, and it required the labor of the greater part of society to produce the necessities of life, it was natural for the crafty and the strong to live off the labor of the weak, but machinery is the key to civilization, the open sesame to co-operative life; this and the struggle between the warring classes of society brings us each year a little nearer to the altruistic ideal, for the last class war is now being fought and the signs point to the workers as the coming ruling class, and to Socialism as the coming social system. For the first time in the world's history, it is possible to establish a true

democracy, that of material equality; and a true morality, that of universal co-operation.

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS is knowledge of the fact that individual interest is best subserved by furthering the interest of the entire class, of which the individual is a member.

Capitalists are class conscious; they make and support laws which enable them to exploit the working class and to keep that class in ignorance and subjection.

A class conscious workingman is one who realizes (1) that he can better his condition permanently, only as the condition of his entire class is bettered; (2) that the workers can emancipate themselves only by abolishing entirely the exploiting class and that any political scheme which stops short of this would leave the propertiless still dependent upon and slaves to those who control the means of living.

Class consciousness and class struggle are purely economic terms; they imply not mere social distinction but opposition of economic interest.

It is not only necessary to understand what is meant by class consciousness; it is very necessary to know the reason why Socialists insist so strongly upon its being taught and understood. That reason is this—**THAT ANY CLASS WHICH DESIRES TO BETTER ITS ECONOMIC CONDITION MUST CONTROL THE POLITICAL POWER;** and to get this control it must make a united class conscious movement.

To prevent the movement being sidetracked, it is extremely important that it should be class conscious as only by a recognition of identity of interest can solidarity be secured.

In connection with this subject, it is well to note how the present ruling class (the capitalist class) developed. The modern capitalists are the successors of the old Burgesses or freemen of the cities. So long as the production of commodities was with primitive tools and the market was limited to the local town or village, these Burgesses were simply prosperous workingmen; but with the development of commerce with other towns and with foreign countries, the invention of machinery, the discovery of America, etc., these Burgesses became rich. But they were still under the power of the kings and barons, and these kings and barons were continually extorting wealth from them.

In order to emancipate themselves, the capitalists had to capture the political power, but they could not get the political power without the aid of the working class; they, therefore, became the champions of the working class; they educated the workers on the subject of rights and justice, and through this agitation the workers eventually got the ballot. After the capitalists had wrested political power from the Feudal nobility, etc., they continued to use the votes of the workers to fight other capitalists, whose interests were opposed to their own.

Thus, we see that the votes of the workers have always been used, not to free the workers, but to fight the enemies of the capitalists.

But the capitalists, in order to wrest power from kings and priests and Feudal nobility, educated the

workers. and the workers are now beginning to use the same weapon to overthrow the capitalists that the capitalists used in overcoming the Feudal nobility.

Not only have the capitalists forged the weapons which will eventually destroy them as a class, but they have also brought about the conditions which absolutely force the workers to use these weapons, for as machinery increases its power, fewer and fewer men are required; the proletariat (propertiless workers) become absolute paupers, dependent upon charity; now WHEN AN ECONOMIC SYSTEM WILL NO LONGER FEED THE PEOPLE, THEY ARE COMPELLED TO COMBINE AND OVERTHROW IT.

It is evident that opposition of economic interest must result in opposition of political views, and it is also evident that the class which controls the political power, and thereby the economic forces, is enabled to exploit the other classes, and with the wealth it wrings from them it secures luxury and education and refinement, and it is the possession of these things that makes social distinction.

It is by owning their means of living that capitalists control and exploit the workers; and to assert that there is no class struggle is to assert that the worker and his employer have the same economic interest, which is an absurdity, as we all know that it is to the economic interest of the capitalist to pay as low wages and to wring as much profit from his men as he possibly can, while the worker tries to get as much wages for as little work as possible. The utter absurdity of denying the class struggle becomes at once apparent when we ask: Has the slave the same economic inter-

est as his master? or, has the parasite identity of interest with its victim?

Once the worker fully realizes that it is not scarcity of food, but exploitation, that causes poverty; that it is the ownership of the means of living by capitalists that causes him to be a slave, then he can never be misled by any schemes of Single Tax, Free Silver, Populism, public ownership of railways, etc., all of which would leave him still in the power of the capitalists. He sees that it is foolish to expect the rich to work for his emancipation; the rich have but little to gain by Socialism; under Socialism they would have liberty, but under this system wealth gives them privilege and license to live in idle luxury and debauchery, and besides, they would lose the power and distinction they now enjoy; under Socialism, they would require merit to acquire distinction; but now, all they need is wealth.

A worker who is not class conscious may imagine that the public ownership of railways, gasworks, etc., is a remedy for exploitation, whereas it merely means that the bondholders are making use of the Government to exploit the people and by reducing taxes and expenses, enable capitalists to reduce wages and landlords to increase rents. But the worker who is class conscious can see that exploitation is the cause, and that it is not to his interest to save the middle class exploiters from being crushed out by the rich; it is not to his interest to have public ownership of railways, etc., **BY A CAPITALISTICALLY CONTROLLED STATE. THE WORKER WOULD BE NO BETTER OFF IF EXPLOITED BY THE STATE or municipality, than when exploited by the private capitalist.**

What the class conscious Socialist wants is to abolish exploitation in all its forms, and he insists upon workers recognizing that they can gain nothing of value except by controlling the political power.

Political power gives control of the economic power; it is therefore the key to emancipation and only by political action on class conscious lines can we get possession of this key. To assert that there is no class struggle is to show utter ignorance of the subject or gross indifference to the truth.

INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION.

Most people, even anti-Socialists, will admit that industrial methods have changed and are still changing.

Previous to about 1750 the tools used and the industrial methods in vogue were but very little better than those used by the ancient Romans.

The past century has seen greater industrial changes than all the previous centuries recorded in history.

In the 18th century—slow, laborious production with primitive tools and with human muscles as the motive power.

To-day—rapid and large production with steam, electricity, etc., as the motive power.

Last century—the producers toiled in their little workshops.

To-day—thousands produce together in gigantic factories and foundries.

Last century—the little store, the little farm, the small (financially) proprietor.

To-day—the department store, the Bonanza farm, the Gigantic Trust.

What honest man can contemplate the marvelous machines and the enormous trust organizations of to-day and then say that things are as they always were?

Now, if it be true that the industrial system is evolving, and that the great trusts are forming the various branches of industry into national concerns, what effect will it have upon society? What will be the outcome of this evolution? If not Socialism, what?

The trusts have established social production and distribution on a national basis in many industries; the next step is social ownership of the means of production and distribution, for to the owner of these belongs the product.

THE WORKERS SOCIALLY PRODUCE, BUT THE CAPITALISTS INDIVIDUALLY OWN THE PRODUCT.

The development of trusts renders the capitalists unnecessary; they become mere shareholders; their only function being to take profits; their former work, that of superintendence, etc., is now done by hired men **WHO CAN WORK JUST AS WELL FOR THE STATE** as for the company. Thus, the trust organizes and fits the workers for the future Socialist system.

It being the nature of evolution to eliminate the unnecessary, it is evident that the capitalists as a class are doomed to extinction; the capitalist mode of production displaces labor and middlemen, and finally capitalists themselves.

That Socialism is the next stage of social evolution is (so far as logical reasoning can prove) certain; that this system cannot last many years longer is equally

certain. There are probably at this moment several million unemployed persons in the United States; yet each year over **HALF A MILLION CHILDREN LEAVE SCHOOL AND ENTER THE LABOR MARKET**; each year more and more machinery is introduced—**THE LABOR ARMY CONSTANTLY GROWING, YET FEWER WORKERS REQUIRED** to supply the needs of society.

It will not be many years before the unemployed will be so numerous that, as Marx said, the capitalists will have to dole out their profits, in the form of charity to the unemployed, etc.

Yes! some people say, "but the capitalist system is very elastic; it may last for years and years yet!"

Now, there is nothing so elastic but that its breaking point can be reached. The elasticity of the capitalist system is of course its power of adaptation; the power of adaptation is limited to the ability to exist at all; animal and social organisms are capable of considerable variation, but when the process of adaptation has reached a certain point, you will find that the animal or social organism is no longer what it originally was, a time comes when it will bear no resemblance to its previous self, in conforming to changing conditions, the organism has been compelled to change its nature; the change has been imperceptible, but it is complete. So with our present system; it is changing now, but most people are blind so far as economic phenomena are concerned.

We are rapidly nearing the culmination of the capitalist system, the last stage will be traveled in a much shorter time than the earlier stages were, for, as Karl Marx said, "The transformation of scattered private

property arising from industrial labor into capitalist private property, is naturally a process incomparably more protracted, violent and difficult, than the transformation of capitalist private property, already practically resting on socialized production, into socialized property. In the former cases we had the expropriation of the masses of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the masses of the people."

UTOPIANS, CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS, GOOD MEN, ETC.

To the Utopian Socialist—Socialism is not a stage of evolution but is a personal conception, the brilliant idea of some genius; the Utopian thinks Socialism is to be brought about, not by the complete overthrow of the capitalist class through a political struggle, but, by teaching people how to co-operate, etc.

The Christian Socialists imagine that better conditions for the workers can be brought about by ethical teaching, by making good men, voting for good men, etc.

To prove that religious teaching affects the matter, the Christian Socialist must prove that religious men are not profit takers, that they take nothing without giving an equivalent.

It is well known that Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Wanamaker and other great monopolists are quite religious.

On the other hand, the Athiest, in order to show that religion is (as some claim) the cause of social misery, must prove that freedom from religious belief makes men just.

Men's conduct toward each other is determined primarily, not by moral teachings, but by their economic relations, it is impossible for men to be fraternal when their interests clash and mere ethical teaching will not prevent their interests clashing.

The futility of ethical teaching without improving conditions is shown by the fact that most criminals profess religion; out of 1,319 criminals at Joliet, 825 had a common school education, 90 had a collegiate education, only 286 were intemperate, 960 were Americans and only 216 were without religious belief. It thus appears that neither illiteracy, intemperance, nor want of religious teaching was the cause of their crimes, and as regards men being naturally bad, Mr. D. G. Ritchie says: "If acquired characters (bodily or mental) were transmissible, breeders would surely have made use of the fact, whereas whatever theories they may have, they have depended entirely in practice on the judicious pairing of sires and dams.

If you declare that Socialism can come only by having good men, you imply that it will never come, because it can be conclusively proved that good men can come only through good conditions, it is environment that shapes the man.

The workers can better their environment only by an uncompromising class conscious movement.

To appeal to sense of justice, to trust to ethical teaching of the christian sort is simply to ask the capitalists to voluntarily resign their plunder. Does history furnish any event to justify the belief that they will do so?

Whether intentionally or not, advocates of such ap-

peals act as allies of the capitalist class, even as a wife may, by throwing her arms around her husband, prevent him from defending himself, so these people confuse the workers and retard their organization, and be their intentions good or evil, misleaders and false teachers are the enemies of the people.

Utopians, Christian Socialists, Theosophists, etc., tell us that we should be brotherly and have consideration for the capitalists; they say "there's no real class antagonism; it's all due to ignorance, etc."

"Oh no! there's no class struggle, there's no opposition of interest. It is not to the interest of the capitalist to get all he can out of labor; it is not to the interest of the worker to get as much wages for as little work as possible. The reason the workers starve in the midst of plenty or drudge their lives away for a beggarly pittance, is not because they are exploited slaves, it is simply because the capitalists are ignorant."

We must not say there's a class struggle, it sounds too harsh; no, we must be considerate and brotherly; in short we should tell lies, we should deny facts, we should kiss the oppressor and the thief, we should pander to wrong and injustice, we should smile at falsehood and give truth a stab in the back.

Scientific Socialists insist that class consciousness is fundamentally necessary. One would think that the workers, suffering as they do, would be naturally class conscious, but so many influences conspire to keep them ignorant, we must remember that they are taught capitalist ideas and receive capitalist education. moreover the many political schemes, such as

protection, free silver, single tax, public ownership of railways, etc., all help to confuse the worker.

It seems extremely difficult for the average man to realize that none of these schemes would better the condition of the working class, yet this can be easily proved, for wages being always relative to the cost of living, if the cost of living be reduced the wages will be likewise reduced through the continuous competition, of the unemployed, for work. The single tax scheme would not furnish employment because to employ himself a man must produce something that will sell, in order to pay his taxes, etc., we already produce more than can be sold, moreover small production is being crushed out, it cannot produce cheaply, only men with large capital and the best machinery, etc., can make production profitable.

IF WAGE WORKERS COULD SEE THAT THE REASON MEN STARVE, IS NOT BECAUSE THERE IS FAMINE, BUT BECAUSE THE ABUNDANCE IS POSSESSED BY THE RICH; AND THAT WE WORK LONG HOURS, NOT BECAUSE IT IS NECESSARY, BUT BECAUSE THE PRESENT ANARCHISTIC COMPETITIVE SYSTEM CAUSES A TREMENDOUS WASTE OF LABOR; IF THE WORKERS COULD ONLY SEE THIS, THEN THEY WOULD SOON UNDERSTAND WHY SOCIALISTS MAINTAIN THAT THE WORKING CLASS CAN GET NOTHING OF REAL BENEFIT, UNTIL IT CAPTURES THE POLITICAL POWER.

None of the Populist middle class and direct legislation schemes can better the conditions of the working class.

Of what value would the initiative and referendum

be to people who do not know their class interest, they are more than likely to use these weapons to their own detriment; this is the reason scientific Socialists attach no importance to the initiative and referendum until a sufficient number of people understand Socialism.

HUMAN NATURE.

The trouble with Utopians, etc., is that they take no cognizance of Evolution. When they first read "Looking Backward" (or some similar book) they become enraptured with Socialism, they speak to their friends about it and get into disputes, and as their conception of Socialism is entirely Utopian, they find themselves unable to meet the arguments of their opponents. Having no scientific basis for their belief they can be easily beaten in debate; and the cynical allusions to human nature, man's natural selfishness and that sort of thing, compels them to reluctantly give up their Socialism and to regard it merely as a beautiful dream.

Now history shows that what is termed Human nature (i. e. ideas, tastes, dispositions, etc.), is a very variable compound. We all know how widely individual tastes differ and how different are the various ideals of the beautiful.

To a Socialist speaking on the street to a crowd of stolid or sneering workmen, there is probably nothing more beautiful than the gleam of intelligence in the eyes of a sympathizer or brother Socialist, but of course a sculptor or artist would have a different ideal of the beautiful.

We find that Human nature differs in every country and in every age and always takes shape from the prevailing mode of economic production. It was once human nature to eat one's fellowmen. It was once human nature for all free men to go armed and take immediate personal action to redress wrongs, etc., and to engage in family feuds and duels.

When the Socialist system prevails, the average person will then probably declare that it is not human nature for men to compete in business.

How closely related ideas are to conditions, is shown by the effects of the introduction of machinery; before its introduction very few people indeed thought of collective ownership, for so long as the tools were simple, the worker could own them and employ himself, and private ownership was then considered right, for by owning the tools it guaranteed the product to its producer, but when machinery was introduced, the worker could no longer employ himself, he therefore had to work for the owner of the machinery. The worker then found that though he was still one of the producers, he could not own the product of his labor, that this belonged to the owner of the machinery who gave the workers only a portion of the product in the shape of wages.

When the workers fully realized that production was no longer individual but social, hundreds of men working together in one factory, etc., and that private ownership of the tools of production no longer guaranteed the product to its producers, but instead meant profits for capitalists and wages for producers, then, and not till then did the idea of collective ownership of the tools of production take definite shape, they

began to see the contradiction between the method of production and the method of appropriation of the product, for while the product is socially produced, the individual capitalist appropriates it.

Social production thus forces the idea of social ownership of the means of production.

Who would have thought of advocating public ownership of stage coaches? Probably no one; but when railways supersede the stage coaches and monopolies extort tribute, the sentiment in favor of public ownership becomes very pronounced. A few years hence will probably see all industries in the hands of trusts and monopolies and soon as a great trust controls the bread and groceries of the people, there will be a great clamor for public ownership of these monopolies. Social interest begets desire for social ownership.

Public sentiment changes with changing conditions; ideas that are considered radical to-day will be deemed conservative to-morrow. Many of the musty superstitions of the past are already swept away and soon they will be followed by that greatest of superstitions, the belief that society cannot exist unless private capitalists control its means of living.

It being human nature to look after one's economic interest, it is evident that human nature will not prove an obstacle to the advent of Socialism when economic conditions become unbearable and it becomes obvious that Socialism is the remedy. Socialism will become a necessity through the natural evolution of industry, the unconscious action of economic forces causing a conscious action on the part of the people when forced by their economic needs, and the fact

that the concentration of wealth puts an end to the private property of the vast majority of people, makes them the more ready to advocate social ownership.

THE SOCIAL ORGANISM.

Socialists maintain that society is not a mere aggregate of individuals, but is an organism of interdependent parts. Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Bain, and other great scientists are alike agreed upon this, but many persons believe that men are naturally antagonistic, that their interests must necessarily clash, that Government must necessarily be despotic.

Now it is evident that if Government were despotic to all men, it would be speedily abolished; investigation soon shows us that the reason Government is despotic to the lower classes, is the simple fact that it is the tool of the ruling class, as Marx said: "It is the committee for managing the common affairs of the ruling class."

As for antagonism, the interests of employer and employee, foreman and man, business man and rival, are diametrically opposed; how is it possible for them to be fraternal? It is not man's nature, but the competitive system, that is at fault in this matter.

Men are simply what the social system makes them. In primitive society there was no place for philosophers and poets, only hunters and warriors were required. In the present competitive system a place can be found only for good business men, that is, good smooth hypocrites, grasping usurers, merciless, grinding taskmasters, double dealing thieves, these are the fittest for the competitive system, and they survive,

while thousands of honest men are denied an opportunity to earn a living. If a man be a pugnacious pugilist, a tatooed freak or a hideous human monstrosity, he is sure to receive a good income, but a brilliant philosopher (if poor) would die of starvation unless the capitalists could make profit out of him.

But though the management of society is not at present what it should be, still even now, it gives more freedom than it takes away. The man outside society would be a slave to nature, perpetually drudging with primitive tools to eke out a living.

Liberty for development and self realization does not exist apart from society.

Aristotle in his discourse on Politics said: "The State is by nature clearly prior to the individual and to the family, since the whole is necessarily prior to the part, the proof that the State is a creature of nature and prior to the individual is, that the individual when isolated is not self-sufficing and therefor is like a part in relation to the whole. But he who is unable to live in society or who has no need because he is sufficient unto himself must be either a Beast or a God."

VALUE, SURPLUS VALUE, CAPITAL, MONEY,
ETC.

EXCHANGE VALUE, that for which on the average a commodity exchanges and is determined by the quantity of Socially necessary labor time embodied in the commodity.

USE VALUE, the useful properties of a thing. A use value does not necessarily have exchange

value, but to have exchange value a thing must have utility.

SURPLUS VALUE, crystalized unpaid labor; that part of the products of labor which is appropriated by the capitalist.

PROFIT, that part of the surplus value which is left to the capitalist after dividing up with the landlords, tax collectors, railway companies, etc.

COMMODITIES, things which have a market value, i. e., are bought and sold publicly.

WEALTH, an accumulation of commodities and use values, not commodities.

CAPITAL, aggregate products of labor (including money) appropriated by the capitalists and used for the production of more wealth.

CONSTANT CAPITAL, the raw materials, buildings, machinery, plant, etc.

VARIABLE CAPITAL, the amount paid in wages; it is called variable because in addition to reproducing its own equivalent, it produces a surplus.

CAPITALIST, a person who owns or controls such an amount of capital that his economic interest lies with the capitalist class.

PRICE, the money name or expression of value. Be careful to note that a thing may have a price placed upon it without having exchange value.

MONEY, is the universal equivalent of commodity values, it is the commodity which is used as the measure of value and the standard of price, (standard of value). It is the measure of value inasmuch as it is the socially recognized incarnation of human labor; it is the standard of

price, inasmuch as it is a fixed weight of metal, as the measure of value it serves to convert the values of all the manifold commodities into prices into imaginary quantities of gold; as the standard of price it measures those quantities of gold.

“Money is itself a commodity and like other commodities its value is determined by the amount of abstract human labor incorporated in it, it is therefore value itself and from its nature can be used as the universal measure of values. A change in the value of gold affects all commodities similarly, and it still remains their universal equivalent because the relative value of commodities remains unaltered, two changes only can result, commodities may rise in value—money remaining the same, or money may fall in value and commodities remain constant.”—Marx.

“The truth is that though gold and silver are not by nature money, money is by nature gold and silver.”

“The fact that money can in certain functions be replaced by symbols,(i. e., Dollar Bills so-called paper money, etc.), of itself gave rise to the mistaken notion that money itself was a mere symbol.” Marx.

Many persons imagine that prices are regulated by the amount of money in circulation. Marx shows that the reverse is true, viz., that the amount of money in circulation is determined by the prices of commodities in the market divided by the number of changes of places made in the time by coins of the same denomination.

Labor power (mental and physical) is a commodity its exchange value is determined primarily by its cost

of production, i. e., the amount required to enable the laborer to live and reproduce his species; this amount varies according to the standards and economic conditions of the various countries.

The exchange value of labor is what it sells for; (i. e., the wages received), its use value is what it really earns.

The capitalist makes profit by buying labor at its exchange value and then making its use value produce more wealth than is paid for the laborer's exchange value, i. e., the capitalist pays to labor in wages less than the commodities sell for, and this being the case, it is evident that the more productive labor becomes (by using improved machinery, etc.), the larger will be the profits; for it must be remembered that labor is paid in wages, not in products.

It is the incorporating of labor into commodities that increases value; for instance, a coat is worth more than the materials of which it is made, yet all that has been added is the labor of the tailor.

Of course there are various kinds of labor, for instance, a shoe made in a factory has embodied in it the labor of thousands of men. Men who handle cattle, tanners, bark dealers, railway men, coal miners, store-keepers, tool-makers, etc. etc, The work of these men is different in quality, but its quantity is all embodied in the product and gives it value; thus value is simply crystalized labor in the abstract, of course the labor must be expended on something socially useful or it will not create exchange value.

It is of great importance not only to know the foregoing definitions, but to grasp their significance.

If what the laborers receive is determined not by

what they produce but by the exchange value of labor, it follows that no tampering with Protective tariffs or money or taxes can help the laborer to get more of his product; that questions of tariff, free trade, money, taxes, etc., do not concern workingmen but capitalists only. The competition of the unemployed will keep wages down, no matter what the system of Tariff or taxation may be.

If labor alone creates value, then it follows that idle profit takers are superfluous, that only workers are necessary to supply the needs of society.

If profit is simply the fleecings from the laborers then the claim that the capitalist creates the surplus value by exchange or by his enterprise, abstinence, etc., is an absurd mis-statement.

The fact that the capitalists by forming monopolies, trusts, etc., sometimes increase the price, does not alter the fact that the ratio of exchange is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor embodied in the commodity, for so soon as large profits are being made, competitors spring up, or if the monopoly is too extortionate, it will destroy its sales, or other things will be used, as oil instead of gas, or acetyline or candles instead of oil, etc. As an actual matter of fact trusts do not usually increase prices, they increase profits principally by reducing cost of production, but in speaking of exchange value we must not take exceptional cases but the general average, and it will be found that over long periods the general average exchange value of commodities will be in ratio to the amount of socially necessary labor time embodied in them.

The value of a commodity would remain constant if

the labor time required for its production also remained constant; but the latter changes with every variation in the productiveness of labor.

Marx points out that the constant part of capital (as distinct from capital spent in wages) must of necessity by the law of competition, inevitably increase in amount and thus lower the rate of profit, though not its absolute amount.

SUMMARY OF THE FACTS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM.

We will now briefly re-state the facts and inferences from which the conclusions of Scientific Socialism are drawn.

The fact that in any society a change in the mode of economic production and exchange has always been followed by a change in the social, political and juridical institutions of that Society.

The fact that Society is an organism.

That men's characters are moulded by their environment.

That the laws and ideas of rights, morals, justice, so-called divine rights to property, titles, etc., at any time prevailing, are merely the dictates of the then ruling class.

That capitalistic exploitation and not scarcity of products or means of production is the cause of the poverty of the working class.

That only by gaining the political power can a lower class emancipate itself from its subjection to the ruling class.

That political power can be gained only by a class conscious movement.

That there is a class struggle.

That there is an evolution in industrial methods.

That we now have a system of social production which conflicts with the existing individual appropriation of the products of social labor.

The fact that as the expansion of the markets cannot keep pace with the expansion of production, a crash becomes inevitable.

That labor alone creates value.

That the capitalists by becoming mere profit takers without any useful function in industry, render themselves no longer necessary as a class in Society.

That the gigantic organization of industries, by crushing out the middle class and rendering capitalists superfluous, leaves but one successor to the political power, viz., the working class; that therefore the future belongs to the working class.

That the working class in order to rule, must establish social ownership of the means of production, together with a system of equal rights and duties to conform to the system of social production.

That a Government of the workers, by the workers, with worker's laws would involve a co-operative commonwealth.

From the foregoing, it will be seen that Scientific Socialism is simply an interpretation of economic phenomena, a philosophy based upon the facts of history.

It is true that the facts and inductions of Scientific Socialism may be questioned, but notwithstanding the numerous fierce attacks made upon them, they have not been successfully refuted; in fact, so invulnerable are they, that a plain workingman, armed with the knowledge of the fundamental principles of

Scientific Socialism can easily defeat the most learned University professor who attacks them; the writer knows of several cases in which professors were unable to hold their own in argument with Socialist working men, in one case the professor was a scientist of international reputation. The fact is, no man can successfully defend error against an opponent who is fairly bright and acquainted with the facts, and when capitalist apologists attempt to prove that Drones and Parasites are public benefactors and that value is created by the mere process of buying and selling or by the abstinence of the capitalist, it is an easy matter to expose the ludicrous nature of their arguments.

The trouble with most anti-Socialists is that they entirely overlook industrial evolution, they imagine that Socialism is a scheme or method that we can adopt or reject, just as we choose; they do not grasp the fact that "it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us." The possession of all the wealth by a few men, the crushing out of the middle class, the destitute condition of millions of propertiless workingmen; this is the condition, and a very few years from now, the question before us will not be, "Is Socialism a perfect, an absolutely flawless system? but, What are we going to do about it? How can we live unless we establish Socialism?"

To those who desire to thoroughly understand Scientific Socialism, the writer earnestly recommends the reading of *The Communist Manifesto*, by Marx and Engels, *Socialism from Utopia to Science*, by Fredk. Engels and "*Capital*" by Karl Marx. The reading of these masterpieces will soon dispel the idea that Socialism is Utopian or anarchistic.

Anarchists are the worst enemies of the Socialist movement; they cast odium upon it; they confuse the workers and retard their organization. By denying that the workers can emancipate themselves only by a class conscious political movement; by denying that society is an organism; and by maintaining that emancipation is to be gained, not by a class struggle, but by individual action, anarchists prove themselves to be either grossly ignorant and illogical or else the allies and willing tools of the capitalists; they endeavor to perpetuate the capitalist system by throwing dust in the eyes of the workers while the capitalists rob them.

The arguments and tactics of Christian Socialists, Theosophists, Single Taxers, etc., all tend to confuse and mislead the workers.

The real Socialist movement springs from material conditions, not personal conceptions, and it advances on lines dictated by economic evolution and the teachings of history; the evolutionary nature of Socialism is shown by its spontaneous growth in all countries where the capitalist system prevails.

Social changes are dependent neither upon ethical teaching, nor upon all the people being educated; for men driven by necessity do not bother about rights, justice, morals, etc., and starving men will (if sufficiently numerous) force the ruling class to make changes, on pain of a revolution, probably bloody and terrible, like that of the French of 1789.

Nor does the advent of a Socialist system depend upon all the workers understanding Socialist principles; when a sufficient number vote for Socialism, it will compel the capitalist parties (Republican, Demo-

cratic and Populist), to form themselves into one party, in order to keep the Socialists out of power; there will then be only two parties; a capitalist party and a Socialist party; this will simplify matters for the workingmen, for though they may not understand Socialism, they will soon understand that the labor party is opposed to their enemies, the capitalists, and they will vote and act accordingly; and each year as the Socialist vote rises higher and higher, the capitalist party will endeavor to stem the tide of Socialism, by offering sops in the shape of national ownership of railways, etc., eight hour work day, initiative and referendum, etc. Thus the person who attaches importance to these measures will find it pays better to vote a radical Socialist ticket than a middle class party ticket, for there is nothing like a big Socialist vote to scare the capitalists into granting palliatives.

It is the tendency of the lower classes to tolerate bad conditions, so long as existence is possible, but when an economic system will no longer enable them to live, they are compelled to combine and change it; a class can be made to think and act on political lines only when forced by economic necessity, but all economic class interests are bound sooner or later to express themselves politically.

Socialism will come as a result of discontent with bad economic conditions; it will come when the workers see that they can save themselves from exploitation only by abolishing the private ownership of the means of living; that is, they must abolish the capitalist system; and as the adoption of any other than the Socialist system would be just simply changing the burden from one shoulder to the other, the working

class will be compelled, in order to completely emancipate itself, to establish the co-operative commonwealth, in which the means of production cease to be private property and become social property; "the economic development itself, with its gigantic productive machinery and its great nationally organized industries, is sure to render abortive all attempts to move in a direction different to Socialism."

Some so-called Socialists (who imagine themselves very practical) ridicule the idea of the co-operative commonwealth; by so doing they prove themselves unscientific, for while it is true that Socialism is not a utopian scheme, with every detail planned out, it is also true that in order to emancipate itself, the working class will be compelled to establish social ownership of the means of production; and it is very evident that this will result in short hours of labor, pure food, good homes, a freer social intercourse, and eventually to as happy conditions as were ever dreamt of by Utopians.

Enough has probably been written to prove that scientific Socialists ARE NOT AIMING AT DIVIDING UP, OR AT A PERIODICAL RE-DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY, or at FOUNDING CO-OPERATIVE COLONIES IN THE BACKWOODS; only by a complete monopoly of all industries can co-operation be made a success.

Scientific Socialism teaches that the Socialist movement can advance only on the lines dictated by economic evolution; that economic evolution by developing a social method of economic production, has prepared the economic basis of the Socialist system, and all that is now necessary

is to organize the workers for the capture of the political power. The working class is destined to be the ruling class. The duty of Socialists therefore is to help evolution by making the workers conscious of their destiny, and by disseminating such sound doctrines that the workers will be prepared for the part they the destined to play.

To all such questions as, Whether the present marriage relations and religious institutions will be maintained, under Socialism? or, Whether the capitalists will be compensated for the seizure of their property? Socialists can return but one answer, viz., they do not know; the future alone will answer such questions; but in reply to the question regarding compensation, we might ask, Does the successful capitalist compensate the rival whose business and prospects he has ruined?

In conclusion, let me say that the most important Socialist doctrine to remember, is:

THAT THE WORKING CLASS CAN EMANCIPATE ITSELF ONLY BY A CLASS CONSCIOUS MOVEMENT AND THE CAPTURE OF THE POLITICAL POWER.

REMONSTRANCE.

To youthful minds how bright the future seems;
 With what gay thoughts Hope's flow'ry pathway
 seems;
 What dreams of Joy and Love and Wealth and Fame,
 What grand ideals, what confidence of aim,
 What freedom from tormenting doubts and fears

And worry's cruel pangs, and cares, and tears.
 But as the years roll by, how callous truth
 Dispels the phantasies and dreams of youth;
 Each fleeting year sees aims and plans prove void
 And hopes by failure's blighting touch destroyed,
 While irksome toil and souring business strife
 Unmask the stern realities of life.
 Each year that's passed at plow or desk or mill
 Sees hope and aim sink lower, lower, till
 At last we dream no more of wealth and fame
 And "steady work" becomes our highest aim.
 And oft men find in crime, a last resort,
 When want incites and work is vainly sought.
 Oh! what a Hell it is to beg for work
 And meet with sneer or condescending smirk,
 To have our wives and babes depend for food
 Upon employer's whim or changing mood
 To sink all pride, all manly feelings down
 And cringe, lest we incur a master's frown.
 What bitter thoughts such slavery inspires
 What torture, what ungratified desires
 To yearn for foreign lands and men to see
 And books and art and nature's forest free,
 Yet be condemned to ceaseless toil and grind,
 To stifle every yearning of the mind.
 Oh! pause and think, my toiling fellow man,
 Can you conceive no other, better plan,
 Than this, which makes us lifelong wretched slaves
 To idle plutocrats and scheming knaves?
 Is this the only way for man to live?
 MUST we, to drones, our labor always give?
 Oh! fellow toiler think, is it not strange?
 That science-gifted man should so arrange

His life, that he must drudge the lifelong day
 While e'en the lowest brutes find hours to play?
 For minutes spent to get subsistence.
 YOU sell your freedom for a pretty speech
 And never learn what e'en the brutes can teach
 Your mind, to ev'ry superstition tied,
 Lets enemies your thoughts and actions guide.
 Bare needs of life are all you get at best,
 No time nor means for pleasure nor for rest,
 No light, no joy, no hope, but in the grave,
 Yet deem it right; YOU ARE INDEED A SLAVE.
 Oh man, what can we say, what can we write,
 To flood your darkened reason with the light?
 Can searching pen nor bold impassioned speech,
 Nor pain nor scathing scorn, your dark mind reach,
 Can logic, reason, truth and common sense
 Arouse nought in thee but a coarse offence?
 Can burning eloquence no thoughts inspire,
 Nor plain self int'rest force thee to inquire—
 What is the cause?

THOMAS BERSFORD.

READ! READ!

A PHILOSOPHY OF HAPPINESS.

(By Thomas Bersford.)

PHX86
B537
1899

"As the field of knowledge is a limitless tract, with paths too numerous to traverse in one brief life, I believe that the wisest philosopher is he who searches for the materially useful and avoids the allurements and brilliant inanities of metaphysical speculation, who prefers simple inductions from facts to elaborate theories based upon abstractions and permits no sentiment or prejudice to influence his reasoning. Certainly, that man is a bigot who refuses to abandon a belief or a system when proved at variance with science and truth."—Thos. Bersford, in *A Philosophy of Happiness*.

"A book that should cause even the dullest to reflect."—S. F. Class Struggle.

"A book that is well worth reading; it is a very good quarry for speakers."—N. Y. People.

"Its object is to equip the revolvers with the philosophy which has been so long prostituted to the service of economic tyranny."—The Tocsin.

"We think it one of the most effective propaganda books ever published."—The S. F. Tageblatt.

Price, post paid, 10 Cents.

See Address.

The People

National Official Organ of the Socialist Labor Party. Published Weekly at 184 William St., New York, N. Y.

Subscription: 6 Months, 25 Cents: One Year 50 Cents.

The Class Struggle

Official Organ of the S. L. P. for the State of California. Published Weekly at 117 Turk St., San Francisco.

Subscription: 6 Months, 25 Cents; One Year, 50 Cents.

The Tocsin

The Northwestern Advocate of the Socialist Labor Party.

Published Weekly at 412 North Western Bldg.,
Minneapolis, Minn.

Subscription: 6 Months, 25 Cents; One Year, 50 Cents.

Sample copies of above papers may be obtained free by sending addresses to the respective papers.

IF YOU WANT "FACTS"

GET

Bersford's Derringer Pocket-Book of Statistics.

with reliable data compiled especially for the use of Socialists.

All persons who speak, write or argue on Political and economic questions will find this pocket-book invaluable enabling them to support many an argument by statistics from reliable authorities.

Statistics of the Populations, Areas, Votes, date of elections, etc., of the U. S. and of all the leading foreign countries.

Statistics of Money, Wealth, Bonds, Gov't. Revenue and Expenditure, etc.

Startling figures showing Mortgages, concentration of wealth, concentration of industry. Trusts, Watered stocks, Profits and jobberies of large corporations, Large Land-holdings, etc. Displacement of labor by machinery, Female and child labor, Strikes Boycotts, Wages and prices of food, etc., in the past and present in the United States and other countries.

Statistics of murders, suicides, lynchings, criminals, prostitution, tramps, paupers, persons killed on railways, wars. Religious, etc. Statistics of farm and factory, the sweating system and disease. Figures showing Labor's share of its product and the workmen's chance of becoming rich.

Statistics in relation to the Malthusian doctrine. And a great variety of facts and figures of use to persons who study or debate on political and economic subjects.

PRICE (post paid) 15c.

NEW AND MUCH IMPROVED EDITION WILL BE READY ABOUT MAY, 1899.